United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge CASE NUMBER CASE TITLE		Mi	lton I. Shadur	Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge						
			03 C 1511	DATE	3/21/	2003				
			John F. Beckman, III vs. Edward J. Pajian, et al							
MO'	TION:	[In the following of the motion be		ing the motion, e.g., plaintiff, def	endant, 3rd party plaintiff, and	d (b) state briefly the nature				
DOC	CKET ENTRY:				· , <u> - , - , - , - , - , - , - , - , - , </u>					
(1)	☐ Filed	Filed motion of [use listing in "Motion" box above.]								
(2)	□ Brief	Brief in support of motion due								
(3)	□ Answ	er brief to moti	on due Reply	to answer brief due	<u>-</u> -					
(4)	□ Rulin	g/Hearing on _	set fora	t						
(5)	□ Statu	Status hearing[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at								
(6)	☐ Pretri	Pretrial conference[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at								
(7)	☐ Trial)	Trial[set for/re-set for] on at								
(8)	☐ [Bene	[Bench/Jury trial] [Hearing] held/continued to at								
(9)		This case is dismissed [with/without] prejudice and without costs[by/agreement/pursuant to] FRCP4(m) Local Rule 41.1 FRCP41(a)(1) FRCP41(a)(2).								
(10)	it is stricken and Affirma	in its entirety	r, but without prejus. Leave is granted	im Order. Because of dice to his repleading v to file such a replacen	via a self-contained.	Amended Answer				
(11)) 📕 (For:	further detail see	e order attached to the	original minute order.]						
(-,,)	No notices required,			original militare material		Document				
	No notices required.				number of notices	Number				
/	Notices mailed by ju-	_	1	†	AR 2 4 2003					
	Notified counsel by t Docketing to mail no	•			flate dockered)				
Mail AO 450 form.			1 2000 1012 1	מים יפי ם .	docketing depoty initials					
	Copy to judge/magis	trate judge.	Have replain	A114	V21/200s					
	SN	courtroom deputy's	S1 64 th: 36	U3 M15	date mailed notice					
•••		initials		c/line received in	SN mailing deputy initials					

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

JOHN F. BECKMAN, II	I,)				
	Plaintiff,)				
v.)	No.	03 C	1511	
EDWARD J. PAJIAN, e	t al.,)				
	Defendants.)				0(,
					MAD	•

MEMORANDUM ORDER

Edward Pajian ("Pajian") has filed his Answer and Affirmative Defenses to a personal injury Complaint, stemming from a three-vehicle accident, brought by John Beckman, III ("Beckman") against Pajian, Matthew Lane ("Lane") and Pajian Carpets, Inc. ("Pajian Carpets"). This memorandum order is issued sua sponte to address some problematic aspects of that responsive pleading.

To begin with, Pajian disclaims under the second sentence of Fed. R. Civ. P. ("Rule") 8(b) any ability to respond to the Complaint's allegations as to Pajian Carpets' state of incorporation and principal place of business. Although that disclaimer is proper in form (see App. ¶1 to State Farm Mut.

Auto. Ins. Co. v. Riley, 199 F.R.D. 276, 279 (N.D. Ill. 2001)), the fact that Pajian and Pajian Carpets share the same proper name would strongly suggest the likelihood that he would have at least enough information to support a belief as to the truth of the allegations. This Court does not of course have any actual

knowledge on that score, but the law of probabilities would seem to indicate that Pajian's counsel ought to take a fresh look at the matter.

In somewhat the same vein, if Pajian has knowledge of the severity of the collision (as would seem most likely) such as to confirm the description of Beckman's highly serious injuries as alleged in Complaint ¶15, a like Rule 8(b) disclaimer as to the amount-in-controversy allegation of Complaint ¶4 would also appear questionable. Again Pajian's counsel must review the matter.

To shift to a pleading locution that is clearly impermissible, Pajian cannot decline to answer the jurisdictional allegation of Complaint ¶5 on the premise that it "is one of law, not fact, and is thus properly neither admitted nor denied."

That is at odds both with the mandate of Rule 8(b) and with the principle that legal conclusions are a perfectly proper part of federal pleading (see App. ¶2 to State Farm). Indeed, counsel should take a look at the flat-out admission of jurisdiction that constitutes part of Form 21 of the Appendix of Forms following the Rules, which forms are expressly approved in Rule 84.

What has been said earlier as to Answer $\P 3$ applies with equal force to Answer $\P 13$. Again counsel must take a hard look at the issue.

Answer ¶14 is entirely unsatisfactory. Over and above the

point made earlier as to the need under the first sentence of Rule 8(b) to answer all of a plaintiff's allegations, a purported denial of the Complaint's allegations about Lane's negligence "[t]o the extent that any of the allegations are directed toward this defendant [Pajian]" is nonsensical. Pajian must answer.

Finally, to return to Answer ¶15, Pajian may well take the position of denying that Beckman's injuries resulted from Pajian's alleged negligence. But it seems doubtful that an absolute denial of the injuries themselves may be made in the objective good faith required under Rule 11(b)(4).

Because of those numerous flaws in Pajian's Answer, it is stricken in its entirety, but without prejudice to his repleading via a self-contained Amended Answer and Affirmative Defenses.

Leave is granted to file such a replacement pleading in this Court's chambers (with copies contemporaneously transmitted to counsel for the other parties) on or before April 1, 2003. No charge is to be made to Pajian by its counsel for the added work and expense incurred in correcting counsel's errors. Pajian's counsel are ordered to apprise their client to that effect by letter, with a copy to be transmitted to this Court's chambers as an informational matter (not for filing).

Milton I. Shadur

Senior United States District Judge

Date: March 21, 2003